



Attorney's Docket 060258-0270654  
Client Reference: 2980466US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:  
TUIJA HURTTA ET AL.

Confirmation Number: 8864

Application No.: 09/555,022

Group Art Unit: 2664

Filed: May 23, 2000

Examiner: Yvonne Quy M. Ha

For: INTELLIGENT NETWORK SERVICES IN PACKET-SWITCHED NETWORK

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

AUG 25 2004

Technology Center 2600

AMENDMENT/RESPONSE TRANSMITTAL

Transmitted herewith is an amendment/response for this application.

FEES

The fee for claims and extension of time (37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17) has been calculated as shown below:

	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDIT. FEE
TOTAL	25	25	= 0	x \$ 18.00	= \$ 0.00
INDEP.	3	3	= 0	x \$ 86.00	= \$ 0.00
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP. CLAIM			+	\$ 290.00	= \$ 0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE					\$ 0.00
GRAND TOTAL					\$ 0.00

FEE PAYMENT

Authorization is hereby made to charge the amount of \$0.00 to Deposit Account No. 033975. Charge any additional fees required by this paper or credit any overpayment in the manner authorized above. A duplicate of this paper is attached.

Date: August 20, 2004

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2041

  
CARLO M. COTRONE  
Reg. No. 48715

Attorney Docket: 060258/0270654  
Client Reference: 2980466US/Hs/sak



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re PATENT APPLICATION of:  
HURTTA et al.

Confirmation Number: 8864

Application No.: 09/555,022

Group Art Unit: 2664

Filed: May 23, 2000

Examiner: Yvonne Quy M. Ha

Title: INTELLIGENT NETWORK SERVICES IN PACKET-SWITCHED NETWORK

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RECEIVED**

AUG 25 2004

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1, 16, and 19 are independent.

**I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 13, 19-21, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Huotari et al. (WO 96/13949). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Huotari fails to teach or suggest any of the features of the rejected claims.

Independent claim 1 provides:

1. A method for providing a packet-switched network user with a service via the intelligent network, the method comprising:

receiving the network registration of a user in the packet network;

establishing a session for routing functionality of packets originating from and terminating at the user;

forming for the session a control record, by which event management is controlled during the session and which has a functional connection to at least one service control function of an intelligent network service; and

defining at least one of the session events as an intelligent network event to the control record, the encounter of which causes the use of intelligent network control principles.

Huotari fails to teach or suggest any of the above features of claim 1. Huotari is directed to intelligent networks in circuit-switched networks. Huotari teaches nothing whatsoever with respect to packet-switched networks, and its teachings focus on calls, not on sessions. Figure 2 of Huotari illustrates a CS-1 intelligent network architecture, which is an architecture used with circuit-switched networks. As stated in Applicants' specification (page 1, line 30 to page 2, line 5), prior art intelligent networks (such as CS-1) are based on circuit-switched data transmission and cannot be applied to packet-switched devices because the concept of "call" is not known in packet-switched networks.

Moreover, contrary to the reasoning in the Office Action, a virtual private network (VPN) such as disclosed in Huotari does not correspond to a packet-switched network. A virtual private network is a communication network that employs public network resources to provide private network capabilities. A VPN is not inherently a packet-switched network. Huotari itself teaches use of circuit-switched networks in connection with VPNs. (Page 11, lines 11-22.)

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Huotari, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 and 13, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the above reasons and for the additional features recited therein.

Independent claim 19 provides:

19. A packet network node comprising:

an application part to establish and maintain a session for routing functionality of the packets originating from and terminating at a user, the application part being arranged to form a control record for the session in such a manner that at least one of the session events is defined in the control record as an intelligent network event, the encounter of which causes the use of intelligent network control principles, and to use the intelligent network control principles in response to the encounter with the intelligent network event;

session management means for detecting the encounter with the intelligent network event; and

a connection part to transfer packets, to set up a connection to the packet network; and to convey messages between the intelligent network and the application part.

All the above features of claim 19, which are similar to those of claim 1, focus on packet networks and sessions. For at least the above reasons, claim 19 is not anticipated by Huotari. Claims 20, 21, 24, and 25, which depend from claim 19, are patentable for at least the above reasons and for the additional features recited therein.

## **II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action rejected (1) claims 5-8, 14-18, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huotari in view of Monrad et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,122); (2) claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huotari in view of Monrad and Yagel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,657); and (3) claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huotari in view of Yagel and Nakagawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,583,918). Applicants traverse the rejections because the above references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in the rejected claims.

Claims 5-8, 9-12, 14, and 15 depend from claim 1. Monrad, Yagel, and Nakagawa each fail to remedy the deficiencies of Huotari with respect to claim 1. In particular, none of these references discloses, for example, “receiving the network registration of a user in the packet network,” “establishing a session for routing functionality of packets originating from and terminating at the user,” “forming for the session a control record, by which event management is controlled during the session and which has a functional connection to at least one service control function of an intelligent network service,” and “defining at least one of the session events as an intelligent network event to the control record, the encounter of which causes the use of intelligent network control principles,” as recited by claim 1.

More specifically, although Monrad discloses a packet-switched network, Monrad teaches nothing with respect to intelligent networks, and nothing with respect to implementing intelligent network principles in a packet-switched network. If presented with the teachings of both Huotari and Monrad, a person skilled in the art would arrive at a system that provides intelligent network services via the circuit-switched network, and packet-switched connections without the provision of any intelligent network services.

Yagel discloses a management information base builder toolkit for specifying object definitions, and a service logic execution environment 20 (see FIG. 1) that may reside on nodes in an intelligent network. However, Yagel fails to teach or suggest how to implement intelligent network principles in a packet-switched network.

Nakagawa discloses a system in which a credit card is charged on circuit-switched calls, wherein the charging employs an intelligent network. Yet, Nakagawa fails to teach or suggest how to implement intelligent network principles in a packet-switched network.

For at least the above reasons, claims 5-8, 9-12, 14, and 15 are patentable over the cited references, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 16 recites:

16. A method for providing a packet-switched network user with a service via the intelligent network, the method comprising the steps of:

activating a packet data protocol context to convey data packets,

forming for the packet data protocol context a control record, by which the event management of the packet data protocol context is controlled, which control record can be modelled by a state model and which has a functional connection to at least one service control function of an intelligent network service, and

defining at least one of the packet data protocol context events as an intelligent network event to the control record, which event causes the use of intelligent network control principles.

On page 7, the Office Action admitted that Huotari does not disclose “activating a packet data protocol context...” or “defining at least one of the packet...” As described above, Monrad teaches nothing with respect to intelligent networks, and nothing with respect to implementing intelligent network principles in a packet-switched network. Thus, Monrad does not teach or suggest, among other things, “forming the packet data protocol...” or “defining at least one of the packet...,” as recited by claim 16. If presented with the teachings of both Huotari and Monrad, a person skilled in the art would arrive at a system that provides intelligent network services via a circuit-switched network, and packet-switched connections without the provision of any intelligent network services.

For at least the above reasons, claim 16 is patentable over Huotari and Monrad, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Claims 17, 18, 22, and 23 depend from claim 16 and are patentable for the above reasons and for the additional features recited therein.

### III. Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, Applicants request issuance of a notice of allowance indicating the allowability of all pending claims. If anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP



CARLO M. COTRONE

Reg. No. 48715

Tel. No. (703) 905-2041

Fax No. (703) 905-2500

August 20, 2004  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2000